

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/627,530 | 07/24/2003 | Stuart K. Janikowski | LIT-PI-344.3D1 | 2921 | |
| | 7590 01/09/2007 | | EXAM | INER | |
| Stephen R. Christian BBWI P.O. Box 1625 Idaho Falls, ID 83415-3899 | | | LAMB, BRENDA A | | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| 144110 1 4110, 12 | | • | 1734 | | |
| | | | | | |
| • | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 01/09/2007 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| / |
|---|
| |

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| 10/627,530 | JANIKOWSKI ET AL. |
| Examiner | Art Unit |
| Brenda A. Lamb | 1734 |

| | Brenda A. Lamb | 1734 | |
|---|--|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appear | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED 21 December 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS | APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO | OR ALLOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complianc time periods: | ring replies: (1) an amendment, affice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu | idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C | nce, which FR 41.31; or (3) |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing | g date of the final rejecti | on. |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70 | 06.07(f). | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing da | of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi | iate extension fee ce action: or (2) as |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed <u>AMENDMENTS</u> | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of th | ns of the date of e appeal. Since |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | nsideration and/or search (see NO | will <u>not</u> be entered b TE below); | ecause |
| (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or | | | the issues for |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.11 | | ected claims. | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | | mpliant Amendment | (PTOL-324) |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | p.ia.it. / iiiio.ia.iiiorit | (1 1 OE OE+). |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | | timely filed amendme | ent canceling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) the how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | ☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wil ided below or appended. | l be entered and an e | explanation of |
| Claim(s) allowed: <u>5-6.8-13 and 17-19</u> . Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,4,14 and 15</u> . | · | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | sufficient reasons why the affidav | it or other evidence is | necessary and |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome all rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fai | Is to provide a |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | ned. |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowar | nce because: |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (l | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | |
| | | | |
| | | • | |
| | | | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The recitation in newly amended claim 1 that the aperture of the first baffle, second baffle, entry seal baffle and exit seal baffle is sizable and configurable to accept differently sized and shaped substrates of substantially matching, but slightly smaller, cross-section presents new issues which would require further considerations and/or searches since applicant has never before recited that the aperture of the above cited baffles is sizable and configurable to accept differently sized and shaped substrates of substantially matching but slightly smaller cross-section and the newly amended claim 1 would appear to include a rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph since it is unclear how the differently sized and shaped substrate is related to the "non-equidimensional substrate" set forth at line 2 of dependent claim 14.

BRENDA A. LAMB PRIMATY EXAMINER